

Dear History–Social Science Subject Matter Committee of the Instructional Quality Commission,

My name is Keith Jones, and I am the Department Chair of the Social Science department of a public middle school in the Conejo Valley Unified School District in Ventura County. I am respectfully asking for revisions to be made to the 6th grade social science framework in the HSSFW Ch. 10, Pg. 177-180, Lines 45-125. This entire section, which is a fairly large section, reads as though human evolution is fact, and we as educators are expected to believe every portion of what is written within the lines of this section. I know this board works with many professionals in the field of study to put together these CA Social Science frameworks, and a general consensus is usually determined. However, please note, in science and history, there are two theories, and I do repeat the word theories: creation and evolution. Yes, they are conflicting theories, but they are both theories. Reading this framework, the evolution of human is stated as fact and not theory, without consideration of Creation.

On lines 80-81 it is stated "Using archeological (archaeological) evidence, such as the carbon dating of bones..." , which leads one to believe the science of Carbon Dating (C14) is accurate and proves the facts behind evolution. Science has actually proven carbon dating to be very inaccurate, especially when looking at the age of bones. Please take strong consideration in revising this information. A good description of the problem in attempting to use the Carbon-14 dating method is found in the words of Dr. Robert Lee. In 1981, he wrote an article for the Anthropological Journal of Canada, in which stated:

"The troubles of the radiocarbon dating method are undeniably deep and serious. Despite 35 years of technological refinement and better understanding, the underlying assumptions have been strongly challenged, and warnings are out that radiocarbon may soon find itself in a crisis situation. Continuing use of the method depends on a fix-it-as-we-go approach, allowing for contamination here, fractionation there, and calibration whenever possible. It should be no surprise then, that fully half of the dates are rejected. The wonder is, surely, that the remaining half has come to be accepted.... No matter how useful it is, though, the radiocarbon method is still not capable of yielding accurate and reliable results. There are gross discrepancies, the chronology is uneven and relative, and the accepted dates are actually the selected dates."

The only area of this section that suggests any other potential answers reads in lines 120-123 "The story of how our now fully human ancestors populated the earth starting around 70,000 years ago is fascinating. Although this general narrative is generally understood, some details are known, some controversial, and some yet to be discovered." To me that is not much for looking at the other side of the spectrum of the creation theory. This does very little, if not anything to rebut the theory of evolution, which leads to the general narrative to read as though evolution is fact.

I see this issue causing many problems for both teachers and parents in not only my district, but districts across the state. This is an issue that causes division, especially when it lacks 100% factual evidence, and at a time when our state, and country need to be more united than ever. I please ask that a revision be submitted to

include both creation and evolution theories under the framework equally, or dismiss the entire section on the evolution of humans all together. I have CCed members of our school board for their consideration as well. Thank you for your consideration!

Keith Jones